DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 206 154 FL 012 332

AUTHOR Levenston, Edward A.
TITLE Second Language Lexical Acquisition: Issues and Problems.
INSTITUTION Utrecht State Univ., The Netherlands.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 15p.; In its Interlanguage Studies Bulletin, Utrecht, Volume 4, Number 2 p147-160 Fall 1979.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingualism; Contrastive Linguistics; Elementary Secondary Education; Error Analysis (Language); *Expressive Language; *Language Acquisition; Morphology (Languages); Motivation; *Personality Traits; Phonology; Postsecondary Education; *Receptive Language; *Second Language Learning; Semantics; Syntax; *Vocabulary Development
IDENTIFIERS *Avoidance Behavior

ABSTRACT

Most second language acquisition research has been concerned with grammar or phonology and has failed to discuss lexical acquisition. The main reason for this neglect has been the lack of vocabulary study by linguists. However, recent concern with semantic theory has brought new impetus to work on lexical acquisition. Useful research on lexical acquisition is dependent upon a number of fundamental theoretical issues. Among these are: (1) whether the processes whereby second language vocabulary is acquired parallel those by which first language vocabulary is acquired, (2) what individual personality characteristics affect the learning and use of vocabulary, (3) the stages by which the lexical stock of a second language learner grow and expand and the factors which influence this growth and expansion, (4) the relationship between active/productive and passive/receptive knowledge of vocabulary, and (5) the kinds of research in lexical acquisition further required. Factors that affect the growth and expansion of second language vocabulary include phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic features of the learner's first language, second language, and other Languages with which s/he is acquainted. In addition, the personality, motivation, and knowledge of the learner and the situation in which the learning takes place affect lexical acquisition. (JK)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Interlanguage Studies Bulletin - Utrecht Vol. 4 No. 2. Fall 1979

ED206154

SECOND LANGUAGE LEXICAL ACQUISITION: ISSUES AND PROBLEMS

E.A. Levenston
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

For some years now the study of second language lexical acquisition has been languishing in neglect. Most of the second language acquisition research has been concerned with grammar. There has been some study of phonology. But of the study of lexical acquisition there is hardly anything. Of the 26 articles included in Evelyn Hatch's (1978) recent book of readings on second language acquisition, only one is specifically concerned with vocabulary; of the 97 studies abstracted at the end of her book, none deal exclusively with lexis and only two give it a mention.

"Neglect" is perhaps an understatement; one might almost say that second language lexical acquisition has been a victim of discrimination. Justification for using such a loaded expression comes from the frequency with which investigations refer to "language" or "interlanguage" when all they mean is "grammar" or "interlanguage grammar" (using grammar in its old, pre-Chomsky sense of syntax and morphology). This practice is equally rife in all relevant fields of research: error analysis, contrastive analysis and the main line of interlanguage studies.

Consider first the work on error analysis. As recently as September-October 1978 there appeared an article entitled "A Study of the Frequency and Communicative Effects of Errors in Spanish" (Gunterman: 1978), where all the errors discussed are errors of grammar, though you would never suspect this from the title. Don't lexical errors affect communication in Spanish? They certainly do in German. The same journal contains another article, "Errors of English speakers of German as perceived and evaluated by German natives" (Politzer: 1978). The German natives were asked to grade for "seriousness" a number of errors classified according to six categories - one phonological, four grammatical (verb morphology, gender confusion, case ending, word order) and one lexical. And all other classes of error were graded as less serious than vocabulary errors. The author sums up his research in the following sentence: "Not unexpectedly, speakers of German seem to know quite intuitively that using the right word is the most important aspect of language use." The speakers may know this, but this knowledge is not reflected in the weight given to lexical usage in most studies of error analysis. Jain (1974) in "Error Analysis: Source, Cause and Significance," discusses one single lexical error (He drives a scooter), among dozens of grammatical errors.

Second, contrastive analysis. Among the 116 dissertations listed by the Selinkers (1972) in their annotated bibliography of U.S. Ph.D. dissertations in contrastive linguistics is one entitled "A Contrastive Analysis of Cebuano and English" (Anderson: 1965). And what do Cebuano and English consist of, that they can be contrastively analysed? To quote the annotation, it "includes [consists of] phonemes, syntax, phrase structure, intonation, transformation structure." But, you'll note, no vocabulary! In fact, of the 116 dissertations listed, only 3, (21, 41, and 60) are in any way concerned with vocabulary, and one of these only incidentally. The large-scale East European projects in contrastive analysis in Yugoslavia, Roumania, and Poland also did very little work in lexical

FL 02 332

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Edward Levenston
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

contrastive analysis though there are signs of a change for the better.

As for the main line of L2 acquisition studies, stemming -- as they say -- from Larry Selinker's (1972) seminal article "Interlanguage," note that Selinker himself mentions in passing only a single piece of lexical performance data -- "drive a bicycle" -- yes, the self-same error discussed by Jain, only with the scooter transformed into a bicycle. Small wonder, then, that a later study in this tradition entitled "Similarities and Simplification in the Interlanguage of L2 Learners" (Fathman. 1973) has no mention whatever of vocabulary! Morpheme acquisition sequence, of course, that great passion of American interlanguage investigators, and "errors in the production of grammatical structures," but no vocabulary. So why isn't the article called "...in the Interlanguage grammar of L2 learners"?

The reasons for this neglect, or discrimination, are not hard to find (Marton : 1977). In part it derives from the emphasis placed, both by language teaching methodologists and language acquisition researchers, on the beginning stage. Granted the common, yet probably mistaken, belief that "vocabulary acquisition can be delayed until a substantial proportion of the grammatical system has been learned" (Wilkins: 1972), it has seemed natural to concentrate on grammar. Certainly the interesting problems in lexical acquisition begin to arise with intermediate to advanced learners. But the main reason for the neglect of lexical acquisition is the neglect of vocabulary study by linguists in general and psycholinguists in particular. The linguists prefer grammar and phonology since these can be analysed scientifically, as structured systems, unlike vocabulary which until very recently has -- with insignificant exceptions like kinship terms -- almost defied systematic structural analysis. And the psycholinguists have been reacting against the earlier tendency of learning-theory-oriented linguists to concentrate on vocabulary learning, explainable as associative learning, rather that grammar acquisition which needed rules. But the tide is turning -- witness the recent flood of elementary textbooks on semantics (Leech: 1974, Fodor: 1977, Palmer: 1976, Lyons: 1977). In particular, the subtle and extensive componential analysis in Miller and Johnson-Laird's (1976) Language and Perception should give new impetus to work on lexical acquisition.

However, before any useful research on lexical acquisition can take place it is necessary to confront a number of fundamental theoretical issues; one of the consequences of neglect has been the failure even to consider several basic problems, some of them much discussed in connection with grammar but totally ignored for lexis. For the remainder of this paper I want to raise what seem to me the most important questions and discuss some of them in detail.

1. How far are the processes whereby second language vocabulary is acquired parallel with those by which first language vocabulary is acquired?

There has of course been much debate on the general question of similarities and differences between first and second language acquisition. But the parallels adduced, for example, by Dulay and Burt (1974) and Ervin-Tripp (1974) have been largely syntactic. For a

contribution to the debate relevant to the study of lexical acquisition, we need to go back to Ervin and Osgood's (1954) distinction between compound and co-ordinate bilingualism. This distinction referred to the way bilinguals store their two vocabularies -- note in passing that the use of "bilingualism" to describe purely lexical phenomena discriminates against grammar and phonology, just as much as later studies discriminate against lexis. For the compound bilingual L2 lexemes are mediated through L1. Each concept already tagged with a L1 lexeme has another L2 label added. Isomorphic translation-equivalence is assumed until proved otherwise. Lexical transfer, positive and negative, is constant. In L1 learning, by contrast, there is no prior set of terms to which labels can be attached; only gradually are concepts acquired and lexemes matched with them. For the compound bilingual, then, second language lexical learning does not parallel L1 learning. By contrast, for the co-ordinate bilingual, who keeps his lexical stores distinct, the processes by which lexemes and concepts are matched must be parallel for the two languages. The lexemes may not match across languages, but the acquisition process is the same. If, that is to say, the distinction between the two types of bilingualism is valid.

It should be remembered that apart from some rather inconclusive studies using the semantic differential as a measure of conceptual distinctness, very little empirical research has ever been carried out into the validity of Osgood's distinction.

In a useful summary of the relevant research, Segalowitz (1977) lists the main studies, comments that "the claim that there are two types of bilingualism is now controversial" and sums up as follows: "The evidence supports the conclusion that there is one semantic system in the brain subserving all the languages of the multilingual, rather than separate processes for each language." But this is a comment on the end-product, so to speak, on the organization of language within the brain once the languages have been acquired. It does not speak to the question how, or by what stages, the language acquisition process takes place. It is precisely here, in the study of lexical acquisition, that the distinction between compound and coordinate processes may prove most useful. In other words, my own hunch is that compound and coordinate are not so much varieties of bilingualism as varieties of lexical acquisition process. All of us bilinguals have acquired some vocabulary compound-fashion and some vocabulary coordinate fashion. In other words, in vocabulary as in syntax there are both parallels and differences between first language and second language acquisition. But how to demonstrate this empirically remains to be shown.

The distinction between compound and coordinate bilingualism or acquisition processes, applies of course to two languages learnt in succession. Curiously enough, there may be some evidence for the hypothesis in an account of how two languages were acquired simultaneously. I refer to Burling's account (1959) of how his son Stephen acquired Gara and English. Stephen, you may remember, was one year and four months old, with a total vocabulary of a mere dozen words, when he first came in contact with Gara speakers, though continuing to hear English from his parents. Of his progress in the acquisition of vocabulary, Burling has this to say: "In some cases he learned a new word in either Gara or English, and for some time used

that word in all circumstances, without ever using an equivalent in the other language, In other cases, however, he simultaneously learned English and Gara words with approximately the same meanings, as though once his understanding reached the point of being able to grasp a concept he was able to use the appropriate words in both languages." Could it be that for the words learnt in either Gara or English, but not both, the process was co-ordinate; for the words produced simultaneously the process was compound, with the double labelling simultaneous instead of consecutive? Unfortunately, Burling gives next to no examples of which words beling to which class. Note also that the words acquired simultaneously are described by Burling as "approximately the same meaning." The implication seems to be that the degree of non-equivalence is only fully realized at some later stage; at first they are regarded as completely equivalent.

It should be pointed out that there is some conflict between the evidence offered by Burling and Ervin-Tripp's dictum: "the basic preference of the child at first is for a principle of one meaning-one form and he rejects two forms for what appears to be an identical meaning or referential situation." (Ervin-Tripp: 1974). She quotes a Chicano child who rejected double vocabulary, noting that "it's not a wolf, but lobo." But she does not give the child's age.

Ervin-Tripp's generalization is too broad, but the distinguishing factors are not clear. It may be a question of age of acquisition, or of the difference between concurrent and consecutive acquisition or -- the more likely explanation in my view -- of personality differences among child learners. The greater the flexibility of mind, the greater the ability to accept more than one label for the same referent. But this is to propose one specific hypothesis in the context of a more general problem which also needs to be considered in its entirety:

2. What individual personality characteristics, if any, affect the learning and use of vocabulary?

Sometimes, it has been suggested, learners strive to keep their languages apart, to maintain a proper distance between them. They will then refuse to credit that the second language functions like their first and reject forms that seem too close for comfort to known first language structures. At other times, learners will allow their languages to come in contact and readily allow transfer from their first to their second language. Note that this formulation of their behaviour has been deliberately ambiguous.It may be interpreted as referring to the same learner at different stages of the learning process, relying on transfer as a beginner but maintaining distance, sometimes needlessly (Kellerman: 1977), as he progresses. Or it may be interpreted as referring to different kinds of learners, some maintaining distance and some reducing it. In an earlier article on grammatical features of interlanguage performance data (Levenston:1971) I referred to over-indulgence and under-representation; given a choice between two target language structures, learners will over-indulge the one closest to therr first language, under-represent the one most distant. But this, as I now realize, was to assume that all learners tend to reduce the distance. For learners who insist on maintaining distance the process might well be reversed: over-indulgence of the more different structures, under-representation of the more similar[2].

And similar behaviour patterns may well be observed in the acquisition of vocabulary, especially cognates. The learner who prefers to maintain distance will tend to avoid them[3]; the learner who brings his languages together will relish the use of cognates and even invent new ones which do not really exist.

But here again we have proposed one specific hypothesis -- cognate avoidance, or preference -- when what needs to be investigated is the whole issue of vocabulary development:

3. By what stages, influenced by what factors, does the lexical stock of a second language learner grow and expand?

Individual personality characteristics can now be seen as only one of a set of factors affecting the growth and expansion of second language vocabulary. These factors can be divided into four sub-categories:

(a) features of the second language -- phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics.
(b) features of the first language -- and other languages known to the learner.
(c) features of the learner -- personality, motivation, previous knowledge
(d) features of the learning situation -- especially input, controlled or uncontrolled, general or specific.

Traditional language teaching methodology had no doubts about what mattered most in controlled classroom situations. Everything depended on the input. What was learnt was what was taught -- or would be if learners weren't so contrary. Syllabuses were defined in terms of the number of words -- and which specific words -- to be acquired in a given period of time. And all the research effort was devoted to determine the most appropriate criteria for the choice of input-frequency, generalizability and so on. Of course, this only made much sense for the beginning stages of language learning. After a certain point, vocabulary expansion was largely uncontrolled, handed over to 'extensive reading', or taken over by the demands of English for special purposes. But the first 500, the first 1000, possibly even the first 3000, could be chosen, presented and acquired. One of the most popular series of textbooks for learning Hebrew in Israel has three volumes: one for beginners entitled "1,000 words", one for intermediate learners entitled "1,000 words and another 2,000", and one for advanced learners entitled "1,000 words and another 5,000". Input, in other words, equals intake.

Obviously, all this has no direct relevance to informal, "natural" language acquisition. But it also ignores many features of the language -- and of cross-language relationships -- which do affect intake, may account in part for the learners' contrariness, and have been the subject of our own research. (Levenston and Blum: 1977, Blum and Levenston: 1979). We have proposed a number of hypotheses concerning features of particular words which affect the likelihood of their being used and retained by the learner.

It should perhaps be stressed here that all hypotheses about lexical acquisition -- or retention -- must be derived from data provided by studies of communication -- or use. Strategies of communication can of course be studied for their own sake. Or they

can be used, as Kleinman (1977) and Schachter (1974) have used them with respect to grammatical structure, to highlight problems of acquisition. And similar techniques, based on interlanguage performance data obtained in communication situations, must be used to study lexical acquisition; any attempt to assess directly the extent of a second language learner's lexical store must inevitably ignore the whole problem of active versus passive knowledge. The hypotheses we have proposed, if valid, concern processes which apply equally to formal and informal learning. Three concern factors which militate against the conversion of input to intake:

i) learners will avoid words which present phonological difficulty

ii) learners will avoid words which present grammatical difficulty, morphological or syntactic

iii) learners will avoid words -- and meanings -- which present semantic difficulty.

And a fourth, broad hypothesis concerns factors which militate in favour of the conversion of input to intake:

iv) learners will prefer words which can be generalized to use in a large number of contexts. In fact they will over-generalize such words, ignoring register restrictions and collocational restraints, fasifying relationships of hyponymy, synonymy and antonymy.

In our published research we have distinguished all these phenomena in the form of a number of separate hypotheses. It is worth stressing, however, that all these processes result in over-generalization of some kind or another. The effect of these four hypotheses can be summarised in familiar terms: in lexis as in grammar there will be over-indulgence and under-representation.

The third hypothesis as formulated here is somewhat vaguer that it used to be. In our earlier work we referred explicitly to void-avoidance: learners will avoid words for which no direct translation-equivalent occurs in their mother tongue. There are two reasons for the reformulation. One is symmetry -- we now have phonological difficulty, grammatical difficulty and semantic difficulty. But that is less significant than the need to include what is in effect a new hypothesis which may be phrased as follows: learners will avoid unreasonable polysemy. This is a fascinating discovery, first proposed so far as I know in an M.A. thesis by Hadassa Kantor of Bar Ilan University (Kantor: 1978), and original enough to warrant discussion at length. There is in Hebrew a verb /lidxot/ which means both "postpone, adjourn" and "reject". English-speaking learners invariably acquire easily the meaning "postpone", but cannot bring themselves to use in in the sense of "reject". It just does not seem reasonable that one word can have two such incompatible meanings, and even lead -- with objects like the "the proposed meeting" -- to most unfortunate ambiguities. Similarly the verb /levaqer/ can mean both "visit" and '"criticize"; learners find it hard to accept both meanings and do not use "criticize".

The day after I read the thesis where this is discussed I was teaching a class in English-Hebrew Hebrew-English translation. One

phrase for translation from Hebrew into English was rendered by the most competent bilinguals, including the native speakers of English, "when the Labour party was in office". The other students preferred "in government" or "in power". It did not seem reasonable, I suspect, that one word "office" could mean both misrad/bureau and shilton/pouvoir. Another English word which might well lose its polysemy in the usage of learners is "fast", not only "moving rapidly" but also -- most unreasonably -- "not moving at all" in such collocations as "stand fast" and "hold fast".

This hypothesis differs from all the others in that it refers not to the acquisition of words but to the acquisition of particular meanings. Which meaning is preferred and which is rejected presumably depends on the sequence and intensity of acquisition. In controlled, formal language situations the first meaning encountered is also likely to be the most frequent. It would be interesting to see whether in informal acquisition, where all kinds of unique situational features may affect the input, there could develop a preference for the less frequent meaning if it were the first encountered.

Concerning phonological difficulty, I do not wish to add anything to the published -- or forthcoming -- accounts of our own research referred to above. I would, however, like to point out that there is interesting support, of a kind, for the hypothesis of phonological avoidance that we were not aware of when we proposed it. I refer to Marianne Celce-Murcia's account of the simultaneous acquisition by her daughter of English and French (Celce-Murcia: 1978). She describes "those cases where Caroline has been exposed to both the English and French equivalent for an object -- but where she avoids or refuses to say the one that is phonologically more difficult in terms of her system." Thus /kuto/ rather that /naif/ since /f/ is difficult, but /boɪ/ rather than /gaRsõ/ since /R/ is also difficult. Admittedly this is a two-year old, and our own research involved adult learners, but the similarity is encouraging.

I have not been adhering to the fourfold sub-categorisation of factors affecting lexical acquisition that I suggested earlier: target language, source language(s), individual learner characteristics and learning situation. This is because of the great amount of interaction. Difficulty, whether phonological, morphological or lexical, must be defined in terms of both first and second language. And individuals also, no doubt, vary in what they will find phonologically difficult -- see for instance the research by Guiora et.al.(1972) on empathy as a personality factor affecting the degree to which a learner speaks with a foreign accent.

In describing some of the factors affecting lexical acquisition I have also been deliberately oversimplifying. I have spoken of "avoidance" as though it means "avoidance of learning", as though learners either acquire or else avoid acquiring, and do not acquire. In actual fact, what empirical research concentrated on interlanguage performance data reveals is use or non-use of lexical items, not acquisition/knowledge or non-acquisition/ignorance of them. Unless such data -- whether obtained from spontaneous speech, discourse completion, or in any other way is immaterial -- is somehow compared with the learner's ability to recognize lexical items, we shall not further our understanding of the relationship between active and passive vocabulary, which names the next fundamental issue which needs to be explored:

4. What is the relationship between active/productive and passive/ receptive knowledge of vocabulary?

This is a simple, not to say simplistic way of stating the problem which blurs all the underlying complexities. These emerge very clearly when the question is reformulated: "Under what circumstances, after how long an interval, subject to what encouraging or discouraging influences, do words, or meanings of words, progress from being vaguely familiar to being accurately identified and then from being sometimes accessible to being fully utilized whenever required?

In other words, there is not a simple binary distinction between active and passive knowledge but rather a continuum of degrees of familiarity, with corresponding degrees of accessibility, or alternatively, if we ignore the words that seem "vaguely familiar", regarding them as not yet "known", we could think in terms of three kinds of vocabulary knowledge: active threshold and passive". This conceptualization introduces the intermediate term "threshold vocabulary" to cover words which are sometimes available for use and sometimes not.

But whatever conceptualization we prefer,a number of empirical questions remain unanswered. Do all words pass first from recognition knowledge to active production? Or do some words enter directly into one's active/productive vocabulary while others remain forever passive? Presumably usefulness is the main criterion; we may acquire for immediate use the words we most need to communicate with. But with the help of paraphrase it is possible to communicate with a very limited vocabulary -- Basic English makes do with 850 words plus 150 for each special purpose. Beyond the beginning stage there is probably for most lexical items a period in the learner's history when they are recognized but not produced. Is there a norm for this time lag ? How long does a word normally remain part of one's passive vocabulary before we start using it? Is our research into factors affecting lexical avoidance invalidated by the fact that all words are, as it were, "avoided" by some learners who just haven't yet got round to producing them? In principle there is a way to investigate this problem. Choose words of a comparable level of frequency to those already tested for phonological, morphological or semantic difficulty but which, as far as you can see, are i) easy to pronounce, ii)morphologically regular and iii) have obvious translation-equivalents in the mother tongue. And then compare the results obtained for use or in avoidance of these "neutral" lexical items with the results previously recorded for words that are phonologically, grammatically or semantically difficult. If there is little or no difference, then the hypotheses may have to be revised, or even rejected. Except that there will remain the possibility that an apparently "neutral" word has been avoided for some unidentified reason -- clearly the whole research project is fraught with difficulties. In addition to which, it can only tell us something about lexical knowledge at a specific point in time; we shall also need more longitudinal studies before we achieve a proper understanding of the relation between knowledge and use of vocabulary.

And this brings me to the last question I would like to raise:

5. What kinds of research in lexical acquisition are required?

To which I would add a supplementary question:"How relevant are

lecical error analysis and lexical contrastive analysis to the study of L2 lexical acquisition?" I wish to enter a plea for eclecticism. In other words, the short answers are "all kinds of research" and "highly relevant". In illustration, let me return to the last of the hypotheses I quoted but did not discuss concerning lexical simplification: "learners will prefer words which can be generalized to use in a large number of contexts", and will in fact over-generalize such words, ignoring register restrictions, collocational restraints and the like. This hardly needs demonstrating. There is supporting evidence from pidginization; Valdman (1977), for instance, quotes the use in a French-Vietnamese pidgin of "content" with the meaning of "vouloir" and "aimer", so that it "... recouvre cette vaste aire sémantique chez les locuteurs les moins compétents." And it has always been one of the principles of vocabulary selection in the compiling of syllabuses. What we need to know is how it works in practice.

Part of the answer can be provided by contrastive lexical analysis, particularly when a range of items in the second language is matched by a single item in the first. This is well demonstrated by Dagut (1977) in his article "Incongruities in Lexical Gridding -- an application of contrastive semantic analysis to language teaching." To quote one simple example, Hebrew-speakers learning English overgeneralize "song", to cover both "song" and "poem", both translated by the single Hebrew item /shir/. As Arabsky (1979) would put it, "song" becomes the primary counterpart of shir, where primary counterpart is defined as the "item in the Interlanguage which represents a whole group of L2 translation-equivalents and thus causes under-differentiation errors" -- for under-differentiation read over-generalization.

In all Dagut's examples there is a one-to-many relationship between the two languages. Contrastive lexical statement is not always so simple. For a more complex example, with a more sophisticated semantic theory, I recommend Barbara Kryk's article on "Verbs of Perception in English and Polish." (Kryk: 1978). This is a strict contrastive statement, without so much as a hint of learners' errors or prediction. But since it is clear from the data that English "feel" may be any of three Polish verbs -- smakować, czuć (zapach) and pachnieć -- depending on syntactic environment, I would not be surprised if English speakers learning Polish under-differentiate/ overgeneralize.

But which word do they prefer? For this we need to go to error analysis. And we may be surprised at what we find. In Haddassa Kantor's thesis, for instance, which I mentioned earlier, there were two kinds of disregard of register restriction, depending on the educational background of the learner. Secular students, who outside the classroom picked up a lot of Hebrew in informal conversation with fellow-Israelis, tended to over-generalize highly informal, slang vocabulary, sometimes with ludicrous results. But religious students, who had learnt a lot of Biblical Hebrew from an early age, sometimes over-generalized the Biblical word; one used shifha, "a female slave", to mean a "charwoman", or "daily help".

Error analysis, however, only shows us the errors. We also need evidence of the kind Moira Linnarud (1979) is engaged in collecting, where the emphasis is placed not on lexical error but lexical variety (the type-token ratio of the text) and lexical sophistication (the degree of difficulty of the lexis used). We need more data about native speaker's lexical usage -- in addition to further empirical

research there is a large amount of untapped data in the great corpus collections of Brown and Trondheim. We need comparative studies of a range of learners who have been subject to a similar input, in order to learn about individual differences in lexical acquisition. We need detailed analysis of a corpus of data taken from one subject over a fairly short period of time, in order to get some idea of the structure of lexical interlanguage. We need longitudinal studies of individual learners, in order to learn more about their approximative lexical systems, if there are such.

In fact, we need more research into second language lexical acquisition!

NOTES

[1]This article is a revised version of a lecture given at the First Nordic Symposium on Interlanguage, Hanaholmen-Hanasaari, Finland, 27-31 August 1979.

[2]This in effect is what is suggested by Nickel (1973) who observes that "certain types of learners ... over-represent structures that are completely new to them." He adds that "this may be a matter of individual or even of national attitude." In other words, perhaps Israelis bring their languages together, Germans keep them apart.

[3]Suggested by Robert Phillipson during the working-party discussion that followed the original lecture.

[4]Suggested by Mike Sharwood Smith during the working-party discussion.

* * * * * *

The following report lists the questions and briefly summarizes (in brackets) the discussion in the original lecture, and quotes some of the more interesting points raised during the working-party sessions.

Q.1: Does the distinction between second language acquisition and second language learning have any relevance for the acquisition of vocabulary? (Probably not).

Q.2: Does the debate on similarities or differences between first language acquisition and second language acquisition have any relevance to the study of lexical acquisition? (Some consider the distinction between "compound" and "co-ordinate" bilingualism as a distinction between types of acquisition <u>process</u> rather than <u>storage</u>.)

Q.3: Why has there been so much discrimination against the study of lexical acquisition? (The use of such an emotive term as discrimination was justified at lenth.)

Q.4: What factors -- apart from lexical input -- govern the growth and expansion of second language vocabulary? ("Avoidance" of vocabulary may be due to phonological, morphological or semantic difficulty. Preference

will be given to words that can be generalized.)

Two further hypotheses were proposed in the working parties:

(a) Learners will tend to avoid lexical items, especially verbs, whose use requires the mastery of difficult syntactic patterns.

(b) Some learners -- those who prefer to maintain "distance" between their languages -- will avoid cognates. Others may over-use them.

Q.5: What is the relationship between active/productive knowledge and passive/receptive knowledge of vocabulary? (Little is known, but the question must be investigated.)

Q.6: What individual personality characteristics, if any, affect the learning and use of vocabulary? (See hypothesis (b) to Q.4 above)

Q.7: How does the possession of a second language affect the acquisition of a third language vocabulary? (Some research available for Finnish/Swedish speakers learning English, but other trilingual situations need to be studied before the results can be generalized.)

Q.8: What kinds of research are necessary to help us find answers to these questions? (Lexical contrastive analysis and lexical error analysis are useful preliminaries. But the main source of information must be interlanguage performance data of one kind or another.)

It was also pointed out that for native speaker usage -- essential for valid generalizations about the difference between interlanguage performance and target language norms -- there is a wealth of information available in the large computerized corpus-collections (Brown, Trondheim, etc.).

▽△▽▽△▽

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Tommy Ray (1965). "A Contrastive Analysis of Cebuano Visayan and English," Ph.D. Dissertation, UCLA.

Arabski, Janusz (1979). "Contrastive studies and interlanguage," PSiCL 10, 135-143.

Blum, Shoshana and E.A. Levenston (1979). "Lexical Simplification in Second-Language Acquisition," Studies in Second Language Acquisition Vol.2 No.2, 1979.

Burling, Robbins (1959). "Language Development of a Garo and English speaking Child," Word 15, 45-68, reprinted in Hatch (1978)

Celce-Murcia, Marianne (1978). "The Simultaneous Acquisition of English and French in a Two-year-old Child," in Evelyn Marcussen Hatch (ed.), Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings, Rowley: Newbury House.

Dagut, M.B. (1977). "Incongruities in Lexical Gridding -- an application of contrastive semantic analysis to language teaching," IRAL 15,3.

Dulay, H.C. and Burt, M.K. (1974). "Second Language Learning and Bilingualism," in C.E.Osgood and T.A.Sebeok, eds. Psycholinguistics, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 139-146.

Ervin-Tripp, Susan M. (1974). "Is second language learning like the first?", TESOL Quarterly 8, 2, 111-127, reprinted in Hatch (1978).

Fathman, Ann (1977). "Similarities and Simplification in the Interlanguage of Second Language Learners," in S.P.Corder and E.Roulet (eds), Actes du 5ème Colloque de Linguistique Appliquée de Neuchâtel, Genève: Librairie Droz.

Fodor, Janet Dean (1977), Semantics: Theories of Meaning in Generative Grammar, Hassocks: The Harvester Press.

Guiora, Alexander, Robert C.L.Brannon and Cecelia Doll (1972). "Empathy and Second Language Learning," Language Learning 22, 111-130.

Gunterman, Gail (1978). "A Study of the Frequency and Communicative Effects of Errors in Spanish," MLJ 62,

Hatch, Evelyn Marcussen (ed)(1978). Second Language Acquisition: A Book of Readings, Rowley: Newbury House.

Jain, M.P. (1974). "Error Analysis: Source, Cause and Significance," In Jack C.Richards (ed.) Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition, London: Longman.

Kantor, Hadassa (1978). "An Analysis of Lexical Errors in the Interlanguage of Hebrew Learners," M.A. dissertation, Bar-Ilan University.

Kellerman, E. (1977). "Towards a Characterisation of the strategy of transfer in second language learning," ISB-Utrecht Vol.2, No.1 58-145.

Kleinmann,Howard H. (1977). "Avoidance Behavior in Adult Second Language Acquisition," Language Learning 27, 1, 93-107.

Kryk, Barbara, (1978). "Some remarks on the verbs of perception in English and Polish," PSiCL 8, 113-131.

Leech, G. (1974). Semantics, London: Penguin.

Levenston, E.A. and S.Blum (1977). "Aspects of Lexical Simplification in the Speech and Writing of Advanced Adult Learners," In S.P.Corder and E.Roulet (eds.), Actes du 5ème Colloque de Linguistique Appliquée de Neuchâtel, Genève: Droz, 51-71.

Levenston, E.A. (1971). "Over-indulgence and under-representation: aspects of mother-tongue interference." in G.Nickel (ed.), Papers in Contrastive Linguistics, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115-121.

Linnarud, Moira (1979). "A Performance Analysis of Swedish Students' English," a report on work in progress for the interlanguage symposium, Hanasaari, August 1979.

Marton, Waldemar (1977). "Foreign Vocabulary Learning as Problem No.1 of Language Teaching at the Advanced Level", ISB-Utrecht 2, 1

Miller, George A. and Philip N.Johnson-Laird (1976). Language and Perception, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Nickel, Gerhard (1973). "Aspects of Error Evaluation and Grading," in Jan Svartvik (ed.), Errata: Papers in Error Analysis, Lund: CWK Gleerup, 24-28.

Palmer, F.R. (1976). Semantics: a new outline, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Politzer, Robert L. (1978). "Errors of English Speakers of German as perceived and evaluated by German natives," MLJ, 62,

Schachter, J. (1974). "An error in error analysis," Language Learning 24, 205-214.

Segalowitz, Norman (1977). "Psychological Perspectives on Bilingual Education," in B.Spolsky and R.L.Cooper (eds.) Frontiers of Bilingual Education, Rowley: Newbury House.

Selinker, L. (1972). "Interlanguage," IRAL, 10, 201-231.

Selinker, Larry and P.J.N.Selinker (1972). "An Annotated Bibliography of U.S. Ph.D. Dissertations in Contrastive Linguistics," Yugoslav Serbo-Croatian-English Contrastive Project: Repart 6, Zagreb.

Valdman, Albert (1977). "L'effet de modèles culturels sur l'élaboration du langage simplifié," in S.P.Corder and E.Roulet (eds) , Actes du 5ème Colloque de Linguistique Appliquée de Neuchâtel, Genève: Droz.

Wilkins, D.A. (1972). Linguistics in Language Teaching, London: Edward Arnold.